

REMARKS

This application has been carefully studied and amended in view of the Office Action dated June 18, 2009. Reconsideration of that Action is requested in view of the following.

Parent Claim 9 has been amended to more clearly define the invention. In that regard, Claim 9 now defines each of the skins as being provided on only one of its faces near its surface with a radiation-absorbent later. Moreover, Claim 9 has been amended to make clear that the core itself has no such absorbent layer. Claim 13 has been amended to delete the feature added to Claim 9 regarding the laser radiation absorbent layer being located on only one face of each of the two skins.

It is respectfully submitted that parent Claim 9 and its dependent claims are patentable over Rinkewich in view of Nettesheim, Dries, et al., and Lusigne . [Various dependent claims were rejected in further combination with Pflug or Ducruy.]

At the outset it is observed that the necessity to combine four different references in itself is an indication of the unobviousness of parent Claim 9.

In the rejection the Examiner stated that “applicant addresses Dries but does not clearly articulate any reason why Dries properly applied in the rejection”. Claim 9 has been amended to make clear why the hypothetical combination of references, including Dries, does not reasonably make obvious the invention of parent Claim 9.

Dries relates to biaxially oriented packaging films which are provided in both of the layers to be welded together, with an absorbent pigment so that a seal seam can be obtained by laser welding: see column 3, lines 29-32. This was required to melt uniformly the entire film (not only the layers provided with a pigment): see the next lines (33-46) of column 3; see also the examples where this feature is present and where complete melting is observed (see column 11, lines 37-40.)


In the method of Claim 9, on the contrary, on a structure provided with a pigment only on one surface of the items to be welded (namely: the surface of the skins to be welded), the formation of asperities at the welding interface, so that kind of black hooks (extending from the pigmented layer of the skin) were mechanically anchored in the material of the honeycomb core, which is of a different composition (not comprising and absorbing pigment). Such a structure contributes to mechanically reinforce the weld so that very good adhesion is obtained without destruction of the orientation of the rest of the skin, even in the welded areas (which is not the case in Dries, where the films are completely melted so that orientation is lost in that area) .

This is not at all suggested by Dries who states, on the contrary, as explained above, that better results are obtained if both layers to be welded contain the pigment so that the complete film can melt.

In fact, even when combining all of the four references used in rejecting Claim 9, one of ordinary skill in the art still has no teaching or even merely a hint to weld oriented skins with an absorbent layer on their surface, onto a core without absorbent layer.

For the reasons submitted above it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of Claim 9 and its dependent claims and that this application should be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Harold Pezzner

Registration No.: 22,112

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

Correspondence Customer Number: 23416

Attorney for Applicant